

REMARKS

It is believed that the claims herein should be allowable to Applicants.

Accordingly, allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6-9, 11-13 and 16-17 are pending in the application.. Applicants have canceled claims 10 and 18. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application.

I. Objection to Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner states that features concerning the left eye and right eye images stated in claims 10 and 18 are not shown in the figures. Applicants have canceled claims 10 and 18.

The Examiner has objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference Applicants attach hereto proposed drawing corrections for approval by the Examiner. Figures 1, 2 and 3 have been corrected to clarify the numerical notations in the figures. Figure 4, previously submitted, is also resubmitted with the notations for the steps of the flowchart. Changes have been noted in red.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because the figures do not include reference signs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Applicants respectfully submit that reference signals 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are not in the description. The reference signals are not present in the application. Applicants believe that the Examiner is confusing the Specification of the present application with the

Translation of the Japanese priority application which was filed merely for support in the Petition for Retroactive License. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Examiner has requested that the designation “Prior Art” accompany Figure 1. Applicants have amended Figure 1 with the requested designation.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because reference numeral 24 was designated for adhesive agent and ultra-hard blade. Applicants have clarified the use of the reference numeral with an amendment to Figure 3.

Additionally, Applicants enclosed proposed Figures 4 and 5. Upon indication that the proposed figures are acceptable, Applicants will submit proposed specification changes.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 6-13, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

The Examiner specifically states that the specification and the claims fail to teach how to “cut[ting] away specified portions of said phase difference film so that a plurality of grooves extending from a first side of said phase difference film to a second side of said phase difference film” as recited in claim 4. Applicants have amended claim 4 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Specifically, claim 4 has been amended to recite a plurality of phase difference film to form separated film regions.

The Examiner states that the specification and the claims fail to teach how a half wave plate is capable of being used for 3D viewing. Applicants have amended claim 13 to overcome the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 18. Applicants have canceled claims 10 and 18.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner states that claims 4, 6-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner states that the sides of the phase difference film recited in claim 4 are confusing and indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 4 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 18 for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have canceled claims 10 and 18.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 for recitation of 38□m. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 for a typographical mistake. Applicants have amended claim 12 to correct the error.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 for a dependency on a canceled claim. Applicants have amended claim 16 to correct the error.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 for an error in reciting polarizing film.

Applicants have amended claim 17 to correct the error.

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 6-13 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,327,285 to Faris (“Faris”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,738 to Okamoto (“Okamoto”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,738 to Gerber et al. (“Gerber”).

The Examiner states that Faris teaches a micropolarizer which can be used spatially. The Examiner states that Faris generally teaches a display system for visually displaying a polarized spatially multiplexed image of a 3D object having left eye image and right eye image mixed within. However, Examiner admits that Faris does not explicitly teach including a protective layer and adhesive layer. The Examiner states that Okamoto in the same field of endeavor teaches a polarizer for use with a liquid crystal display device wherein the polarizer layer is interposed between a pair of TAC film and is adhered via an adhesive layer to a transparent glass substrate. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the micropolarizer to make it adhered to a glass substrate via an adhesive layer and to be covered with a protective layer for the benefit of easy adoption of the micropolarizer to the display device. The Examiner additionally states that Gerber teaches a cutting tool for cutting optical elements.

The present invention, as recited in the amended claims, is directed to a method for manufacturing a film for use with a 3D image display which comprise the steps of forming a laminated assembly of phase difference film and transparent support with an adhesive agent interposed. Specified portions of the phase difference film are cut away with an ultra-hard blade so that a plurality of grooves extend from a first side of the phase difference film to the opposing side.

Neither Faris, Okamoto nor Gerber, either alone or in combination, disclose a transparent support interposed with a plurality of phase difference film. Faris is directed to an electro-optical display system for visually displaying polarized spatially multiplexed images of 3D objects for stereoscopic view. Faris does not disclose or suggest phase difference films and attaching transparent resist members onto said film and eliminating regions of the film where transparent resist members are not present. There is no teaching or suggestion in Okamoto for a transparent support interposed with a plurality of phase difference film. Similarly, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gerber for a transparent support interposed with a plurality of phase difference film.

The Examiner is reminded that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Since the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, either alone or in combination with each other, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been set forth.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that amended claim 4 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 5-9, 11-13, and 16-17, by their dependency on amended claim 4, are similarly allowable.

V. Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 18 as being substantially duplicates thereof.

Applicants have canceled claims 10 and 18, obviating this rejection.

VI. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6-9, 11-13, and 16-17 are now in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Bosco B. Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Date: February 26, 2004
REVEO, INC.
85 Executive Boulevard
Elmsford, New York 10523
Telephone (914) 345-9555
Facsimile: (914) 345-9558